

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 089 421

EA 006 008

AUTHOR Brainard, Edward
TITLE Involving Educators: Six Ideas That Work. An Occasional Paper.
INSTITUTION CPE, Ltd., Denver, Colo.
PUB DATE 73
NOTE 22p.; A related document is EA 006 009
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.75 HC-\$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Guides; *Administrator Role; Educational Assessment; *Educational Improvement; Educational Needs; Elementary Schools; *Foundation Programs; Improvement Programs; Information Dissemination; Information Utilization; Interpersonal Relationship; *Leadership; *Participation; Secondary Schools
IDENTIFIERS *Foundations (Organizations)

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the structure and function of CPE Ltd., an educational foundation devoted to school improvement using humanizing processes. Six ideas were developed to guide the foundation: Encourage potential clientele to determine the foundation's areas of interest; given identified problem areas, encourage interested school administrators to develop a diversity of selected programs within their school districts; form a national collegial team of educational leaders to foster sharing processes among the school districts and professional-personal relationships among these leaders; encourage this group to determine the Foundation's practices and yearly plan of programs, services, and activities; employ a small staff to serve as a catalyst for this team; and after a period of time, dissolve the Foundation's relationship so that the involved educators can themselves become the catalyst. (Author/WM)

ED 089421

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

INVOLVING EDUCATORS:

SIX IDEAS THAT WORK

A CFK Ltd. OCCASIONAL PAPER

FALL 1973

EA 006 008



3333 SOUTH BANNOCK ST.

ENGLEWOOD, COLORADO 80110

This Occasional Paper is dedicated to the memory of

CHARLES F. KETTERING II

1931-1971

TEACHER - ADMINISTRATOR - PHILANTHROPIST

"Those who knew Chuck Kettering knew a most extraordinary man--a teacher--who walked through life with a clearly defined purpose: to use his resources for the good of others. He worked tirelessly to see that goal achieved, and was never too busy to share his insight and wisdom, to extend his hand, to be a friend."

Chuck founded CFK Ltd. and served as Chairman of the Board of Directors.

The author, Edward Brainard, is President of CFK Ltd. and a former school administrator.

PREFACE

The purpose of this paper is twofold. Its first is to describe the essence of six ideas that have been used by CFK Ltd. Its second is to share our experiences with colleagues, especially those with other educational agencies. From them, perhaps, school districts, foundations, state departments of education, university leaders and others dedicated to the improvement of schooling may isolate an idea or two useful to them as they involve people in educational improvement endeavors.

Because the thrusts of CFK Ltd. involve school administrators, that word is used throughout. However, we believe the processes we describe are useful in working on other school based problems or projects and in working with many types of people. Thus, for "administrator," one could substitute professor, teacher, student, or citizen. For similar reasons, the word "foundation" is used throughout. We also believe these words could be substitutes: professional organization or society, school district, university, state department of education, or funding agency.

In short, the ideas of this paper might be adapted to other situations and are not necessarily limited to the operation of a foundation.

INVOLVING EDUCATORS: SIX IDEAS THAT WORK

SIX IDEAS. Chuck Kettering had a deep professional interest in elementary and secondary education. As a philanthropist, he had a concern for the operating styles of foundations and other agencies interested in the improvement of education. Thus, in founding CFK Ltd. in 1967 as an educational foundation he sketched two major thrusts: 1. To work with public school educators on school improvement endeavors of importance to them. In short, CFK Ltd. would exist to run errands for ideas which deal with neglected problems of concern and importance to school district based educators. 2. To operate the foundation using humanizing processes and avoiding more traditional processes such as exercising power over innovative projects and using the prevailing grantor-grantee relationship which is often supervisory or merely contractual.

Given these larger goals, at the inception of CFK Ltd. these six ideas were developed to guide the foundation:

- Encourage the potential clientele (in this case school administrators) to determine the foundation's areas of interest.
- Given identified problem areas, encourage interested school administrators to develop the selected programs within their school districts. Allow wide latitude; encourage diversity.
- Encourage the educators who provide leadership for their districts' programs to form a national collegial team to foster sharing processes among the school districts and professional-personal relationships among these leaders.
- Encourage the team of educators to become Associates of the foundation. Using the task force concept, encourage this group to determine the foundation's practices and yearly plan of programs, services, and activities.
- Employ a small staff to serve as a catalyst for the team of Associates.
- After a period of time dissolve the foundation's relationship, so the involved educators can themselves become the catalyst.

Philosophically, the attitude of the foundation has been that the combination of good ideas and able people makes the real difference in school improvement endeavors, rather than the amount of money available.

Affectively the above ideas are based on trust of the school administrator as a leader and scholar, people-to-people relationships, and that school improvement needs as identified by school administrators are, in fact, significant to the continued search for a better school.

In developing each program area, the CFK Ltd. approach has been to isolate an idea or need identified as significant by practicing school administrators, to issue a call to locate school districts which have as one of their concerns the identified need, to foster field development of the idea or need in participating school districts, to summarize and disseminate practices and results to other educators and school districts.

This differs from another approach which is to identify school improvement needs or ideas through university professors, non-practicing educators or non-educators, to employ teams of experts to articulate the ideas or needs by developing operating plans and organizations, to issue a call to school districts interested in field testing the plans, and to disseminate the materials, plans and results.

CFK Ltd., in practicing its above-mentioned six ideas, stressed collegial people relationships among the involved educators and school improvement programs. The practicing educator has not only been involved in all phases of the developmental process, he has had the dominant role.

ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE SIX IDEAS. The discussion which follows illustrates the above six ideas.

IDEA 1: Encourage the foundation's potential clientele (in this case school administrators) to determine its areas of interest. During Fall 1967 a brief statement about the idea of CFK Ltd. and a survey were prepared. Essentially it reported these facts: The foundation would relate to the improvement of elementary and secondary education. Its precise endeavors would be determined by school administrators who were asked in the survey to identify significant school problems which plague them and which were needs currently being overlooked by school systems and other agencies. The statement and survey were sent to about ninety districts, state departments of education, and universities. The replies of the sixty-seven respondents were grouped into eleven areas of concern. A panel of nine administrators,

together with the CFK Ltd. Board of Directors, selected three areas; the remaining areas dealt with concerns being addressed by other agencies. The selected areas were (1) providing school administrators with continuing education programs--lifelong, on the job learning programs, (2) improving the quality of the school's "climate" or total environment for learning, and (3) annually assessing how the public views its schools.

For each of the first two areas a brief prospectus was prepared. It described the proposed developmental process. The prospectus went on to report that school districts interested in becoming involved must realize the endeavor would be ambiguous. Participants must view it as one where school districts and administrators throughout the nation would be learning and working together. Thus, school districts interested in applying were encouraged to select as their proposed participants administrators who were comfortable working with the intangible and in exploring the unknown. Administrators seeking precise answers for precise problems, and who wished to immediately obtain such from the project, would probably view this endeavor as of little value and may become disenchanted and dissatisfied. Each prospectus went on to report that the products of the total group of districts working together and separately undoubtedly would be able to provide better and more precise answers not only for themselves, but also for colleagues throughout their districts and the nation.

For the third concern, annually assessing how the public views its schools, a project was developed with Dr. George Gallup. The Annual Gallup Poll on the "Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools" is now a regular feature in Phi Delta Kappan each September. Currently work has begun on the sixth annual poll, and a book on the first five polls was published in November 1973.

The following chart presents the historical development of the programs resulting from the development of two of the three themes.

Theme: Develop Self Renewal Programs for School Administrators	Theme: Improve School Climate
<u>Formal Programs</u> • Individualized Continuing Education (ICE) Programs for School Administrators (1968-Present)	<u>Formal Programs</u> • Human Relations School (1968-70) • Improvement of the Quality of the School's Environment (1969-71)
• Principal as the School's Climate Leader (PASCL) (1971-Present) • School Administrator as a Climate Leader (1973-Present) • School Administrator as a Communities Relational Leader (1973-Present)	

To summarize, the basic CFK Ltd. focus is on school improvement through improving the leadership behavior of school administrators. In short, this is administrator renewal. However, a larger focus is toward advancing society through improving schools and their climates. Present CFK Ltd. vehicles for improving administrator behavior and school climate are the ICE/PASCL programs.

ICE pertains to school district organized processes of individualized continuing education (ICE) for school administrators.

PASCL (The Principal as the School's Climate Leader) pertains to only one means of using ICE processes. The PASCL focus is on advancing the quality of school climate through improved administrator leadership.

ICE and PASCL are processes an administrator can use to directly link in-service education and professional growth to planned school improvement projects. They help an administrator use new knowledge about education and, specifically, to fulfill on the job his most important responsibility, which is to continuously

provide leadership for the development of a better school.

IDEA 2: Given identified problem areas, encourage interested school administrators to develop the selected programs within their school districts. Allow wide latitude; encourage diversity. When the prospectus for each problem or theme area was sent to approximately 100 school districts at random, an objective was identified. This objective indicated that each district should develop its own program, and that the result hopefully would be six or more different approaches for each of the two larger problems. Further, each district was provided a three-year funding commitment of approximately \$5,000 each year.

At the outset, the original group of twelve school districts which developed ICE programs and the original seventeen PASCL districts received project funds from CFK Ltd. Presently all school districts are participating without CFK Ltd. financial support.

Today, within the ICE and PASCL endeavors forty-seven school districts and three universities are operating sixty-nine programs. The districts and universities are within the District of Columbia and fifteen states: Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Indiana, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Utah, and Washington.

IDEA 3: Encourage the educators who provide leadership for their districts' programs to form a national collegial team to foster sharing processes among the school districts and professional-personal relationships among these leaders.

IDEA 4: Encourage the team of educators to become Associates of the foundation. Using the task force concept, encourage this group to determine the foundation's practices and yearly plan of programs, services, and activities.

IDEA 5: Employ a small staff to serve as a catalyst for the team of Associates. While the foundation has precise programs in education, it is the foundation's leadership team which develops, refines, and improves the ideas. The major leadership for shepherding the ideas is assumed by the foundation's Associates working as a collegial team. They run the foundation.

The leadership for each participating school district's program related to CFK Ltd. is provided by a program coordinator who also becomes an Associate of the foundation. At the outset coordinators immediately became Associates, and more recently after heading the district's endeavor for a year. In addition, a few educators associated with universities joined the endeavors as Associates.

Presently, the body of Associates consists of sixty-one persons, only two of whom are CFK Ltd. employees. A breakdown follows:

- 4-Members, CFK Ltd. Board of Directors
- 2-Members, CFK Ltd. Staff (full-time President and Executive Assistant)
- 44-School administrators
- 4-University professors
- 4-Executive directors of professional organizations (all of whom previously led school district based programs)
- 2-Management consultants
- 1-University president

The forty-four practicing school administrators hold these positions:

- 10-Superintendents
- 10-Deputy or assistant superintendents
- 9-Senior high school principals
- 8-Directors (Administration, Adult Education, Curriculum, School Services, Secondary Education, District Relations, Staff Development)
- 4-Junior high school principals
- 2-Elementary school principals
- 1-Counselor

In addition, another group of forty-two educators also directs programs associated with CFK Ltd. and will soon be appointed Associates. Among them are:

- 12-Elementary school principals
- 9-Assistant superintendents
- 7-Directors (Staff Development, Instruction, Research, Curriculum)
- 5-Senior high school principals
- 3-Superintendents
- 3-University professors
- 1-Dean, school of education
- 1-Junior high school principal
- 1-Teacher

By early 1974 the body of Associates will include approximately 100 educators.

The final section of this paper lists the involved educators and school systems.

In a forthcoming book reporting results of these programs in the school systems associated with CFK Ltd., Associate Eugene Howard (Superintendent, Urbana, Illinois, Schools), reports that "working systematically on self-improvement and school improvement can be a lonely business unless other administrators are also involved. There is a popular game among school administrators called 'Knock the Project,' which consists of thinking up as many reasons as possible why a new idea is likely to fall flat on its face. Its purpose is to shape up innovators, to get them back in line so that they no longer threaten their colleagues." Thus, Howard lists five reasons why learning teams of colleagues within school systems are important:

- To gain support from colleagues and the school district for one's self and school improvement projects.
- To learn from colleagues and others about self and school improvement ideas that are working and which they might want to adapt.
- To obtain help from colleagues on self assessment processes and results.
- To gain from the involvement the personal satisfaction of being part of a prestige program, recognized by the district as performing an important leadership role.
- To provide unity and direction for a district's administrator renewal program.

In short, an effective collegial team is productive and satisfying.

For the Associates of the foundation, it was necessary to move from a collection of able educators to a collegial team. Among the processes used were:

- National meetings of Associates in Denver two to three times each year.
- Organization of Associate task forces to accomplish the functions outlined below. (These are functions which often would be performed by a foundation's staff or consultants to the foundation.)
- Regional activities of participants in the districts' renewal programs.

In commenting on the Denver meetings, Associate Justus Prentice

(District Superintendent, Board of Cooperative Educational Services, West Nyack, New York) reports that--

in the formal and informal hours of the initial Denver meeting many of us Associates questioned whether the operating concepts of the foundation would really take shape. Looking back, several important decisions came about as a process of operating such a foundation.

For a period of six months, maybe longer, we floundered. In looking at the job of the principal, the superintendent, and the staff, all of our efforts focused on changing others. Some time before the end of the first year, at another Associates' meeting in Denver, it was brought out forcibly that the problem was ourselves. Then we started to look at changing self, rather than changing others, both as Associates and for participants in the programs back in the home districts. This was an important change.

The second important change occurred in the group of Associates itself. It started to become a true collegial group with members supporting each other and working together in their Denver meetings with far greater skills than their initial meetings had shown. The same thing happened in the projects. Collegial group members, after a series of "how to" workshops, began to support each other. This is probably the greatest hope for institutionalization of the programs.

The following chart illustrates the major functions of the Associates as they address for the larger profession each of the program areas adopted by CFK Ltd.

Functions of Associates	Implementation Processes
--Develop school system based and operated individualized continuing education (ICE) programs for school administrators and school climate improvement programs (PASCL).	--School district based Associates provide actual program leadership within their school systems.

Functions of Associates (Continued)	Implementation Processes (Continued)
--Determine needed ICE and PASCL program improvements.	--General body of Associates determines needs at national meetings (see also Planning Task Force).
--Develop yearly CFK Ltd. plan of programs, program improvements, and services.	--Annual Planning Task Force.
--Improve and advance the ICE and PASCL concepts ..Develop occasional papers for purpose of describing improvements	--Associate task forces: During the past three years these task forces have operated to: ..Develop a Self Performance Achievement Record. ..Assist districts in using the Self Performance Achievement Record. ..Develop the Principal as School's Climate Leader program area. ..Improve the definition of and process for improving school climate. ..Develop a plan to phase-out CFK Ltd. ..Develop and operate the Emerging Ideas Fund. ..Develop the CFK Colleagues Program. ..Foster individualized competency based administrator education. ..Develop designs for school district banks of human resources. ..Develop dissemination programs to assist other interested school systems. ..Develop School Administrator as Communities Relational Leader program area. ..Develop an elementary school climate improvement program. ..Develop a secondary school climate improvement program.

Functions of Associates (Continued)	Implementation Processes (Continued)
--Provide program assistance services to participating school systems by geographical areas.	--Six Associates provide catalytic services for participating districts within six regions using-- ..Regional conferences and workshops. ..Inter-district visitation. ..Regional task forces to consult with districts on development of yearly program plans.
--Plan and operate the national conferences.	--Planning task force for each conference.
--Author occasional papers and books.	--Associates on an individual basis serve as authors of materials needed by the school districts.
--Organize non-Associate panels of school administrators to meet with Dr. George Gallup for purpose of determining questions for the Annual Gallup Poll on "The Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools."	--Panel organized for each year's poll.

To summarize, CFK Ltd. consists of two interrelated components: school improvement programs and educators working as collegial teams on these programs. Again, Justus Prentice provides this information:

The status of the program coordinators as Associates of the foundation is extremely important. The attractive part is that he is part of a national program, is listed as an Associate of a national foundation, and has greatly broadened and widened his personal horizons through his contacts with other district-based Associates and the consultant Associates. These are human resources previously not available.

Another important point was brought out by a number of Associates who state that for the first time they were able to get away from the minutiae of day-to-day tasks and look ahead with some hope of finding solutions to problems. Forward steps were achieved that could not have been realized prior to joining the CFK group of Associates. This is a personal satisfaction that gives joy to the school administrator's job.

The key element in making the school improvement programs and Denver meetings meaningful was the human element. The process of practicing what is preached at the national level has been followed in most of the programs at the local level. In the Rockland County project, for example, the participating school administrators were told that they were identified as the participants because they were dedicated people, and they were going to run this program. In both cases, they set the policy for the program, for its monitoring, and for all stages of its implementation and evaluation. The process at the local level was a direct outgrowth of the process at the CFK national level.

Given the policy of active involvement of Associates in the operation of the foundation, the basic role of the foundation's staff has been to facilitate the maximum involvement of participants according to their individual renewal needs and the improvement needs of their schools and districts, as they see them.

Essentially, the foundation's staff members serve as catalysts rather than as directors who establish things for others to do. They serve in a helping relationship; they stimulate and counsel.

IDEA 6: After a period of time dissolve the foundation's relationship, so the involved educators can themselves become the catalyst.

Having largely accomplished the goals identified by the initial survey of school administrators, CFK Ltd. will dissolve in mid-1974. A voluntary, non-staff, dues-supported professional association of the Associates will continue the ideas and programs that have been sponsored by CFK Ltd.

SUMMARY. Hopefully, the reader has obtained from this report a useful idea or two. The importance of trusting and developing a genuine collegial and professional relationship with the persons involved in accomplishing the foundation's reason for being cannot be overemphasized. This factor alone significantly increases commitment.

At the first Denver meeting of Associates, Justus Prentice recorded that Chuck Kettering said several things that were very important, things that he meant sincerely. Among them:

I have been associated with foundations most of my life, and we have spent a lot of money in education. I am not at all convinced that money has made any difference. What has made a difference is dedicated people who are willing to make a change happen. That is the reason that the Associates are invited to Denver at this time. You are dedicated people who make things happen. The foundation will have a different slant than any others that I know. You will run it. As Associates, you will be in a position of determining where this foundation is going to go, and you will set policy.

THE COLLEGIAL TEAM

Listed below are the school systems and the Associates and other educators that made six ideas work.

Alvord Unified School District, Riverside, California

Mrs. Eadith Atkinson, Principal, Collett Elementary School
 Dr. Erwin Hollitz, Assistant Superintendent (now retired)
 Dr. M. Delbert Lobb, Superintendent
 Richard E. Marr, Director, School Services

Board of Cooperative Educational Services, Erie County, Buffalo, New York

Dr. Robert W. Sekowski, Assistant Superintendent, Instruction

Board of Cooperative Educational Services, Rockland County, West Nyack, New York

Dr. Justus A. Prentice, District Superintendent

California State University at Hayward, California

Dr. Lewie Burnett, Dean, School of Education

Chehalis, Washington, School District #303

Larry Norwood, Principal, Chehalis High School

Colville, Washington, Public Schools

Mrs. Sharon Horstman, Teacher, Colville High School
 Dr. James Monasmith, Principal, Colville High School

Compton, California, Unified School District

Dr. Donald Hodes, Assistant Superintendent

Cuyahoga Heights Local School District, Cleveland, Ohio

Dr. Kimball Howes, Principal, Cuyahoga Heights High School

Eastern Washington State College, Cheney, Washington

Dr. Jack Martin, Professor, Department of Education

East Orange, New Jersey, Public Schools

Mrs. Greta D. Murchison, Executive Assistant

Escondido, California, Union School District

Ronald Brumley, Principal, Glen View Elementary School
 Sidney E. Hollins, Certificated Personnel Director
 Dr. James Slezak, Superintendent

Educational Service Unit #3, Omaha, Nebraska

Jim McDowell, Assistant Administrator

Flint Hills Educational Research and Levelopment Association,
 c/o Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia, Kansas

Dr. Vince Bowman, Professor
 Dr. Glenn H. Crumb, Professor (Now Professor, Western
 Kentucky University, Bowling Green, Kentucky)

Glendale, California, Unified School District

Dr. W. Roberts Pedrick, Deputy Superintendent

Idaho Falls, Idaho, School District #91

Mrs. Charleine Baum, Principal, Theresa Bunker Elementary
 School
 Richard Bigelow, Principal, Skyline High School

Jefferson County, Colorado, School District

Dr. George M. Carnie, Principal (Now Assistant Superin-
 tendent and Co-Principal, North East Junior High
 School, Adams County School District 12, Northglenn,
 Colorado)
 Gene Cosby, Area Superintendent, Golden Area
 Dr. Bruce Hudson, Area Superintendent, Mountain Area
 Dr. Gerald Prince, Counselor (Now Co-Principal, North
 East Junior High School, Adams County School
 District 12, Northglenn, Colorado)
 Curt Rokala, Principal, Bell Junior High School

Johnson City, New York, Central School District

Dr. Albert Mamary, Assistant Superintendent

Lincoln, Nebraska, Public Schools

Dr. Elizabeth A. Dillon, Director, Staff Development

Jim Huge, Principal, Lincoln East High School
 Vern L. Martin, Principal, Pershing Elementary School

Livermore, California, Valley Unified School District

Dr. Justin Bardellini, Assistant Superintendent

Los Angeles, California, Unified School District

Dr. R. T. DeVries, Administrative Consultant, Staff
 Development Branch

Mrs. LaVerne Parks, Director, Jordan Educational
 Complex, Administrative Area B

Mayo High School, Independent School District 535, Rochester,
 Minnesota

Dr. Ralph E. Wright, Principal, Mayo High School

Mesa, Arizona, Public Schools

Richard Kilbourne, Executive Director, Secondary Education

Midwest City-Del City Schools, Midwest City, Oklahoma

Dr. Vernon McAllister, Director, Personnel

Mounds View Schools, District 621, St. Paul, Minnesota

Marven Rosen, Assistant Superintendent

Nebo School District, Spanish Fork, Utah

Raymond Peterson, Coordinator, Instruction

Newark, California, Unified School District

Dr. Donald Thomas, Superintendent (Now Superintendent,
 Salt Lake City, Utah, Public Schools)

Mrs. Jean Weaver, Curriculum Specialist

Mrs. May Howard, Principal, John F. Kennedy School

Norwalk-La Mirada Unified School District, Norwalk, California

Clinton Brown, Director, Administration

Dr. Thomas E. Neel, Assistant Superintendent (Now Super-
 intendent, Amphitheater Public Schools, Tucson,
 Arizona)

Dr. Louis Zeyen, Superintendent (Now Executive Director,
 National Academy of School Executives, American
 Association of School Administrators, Arlington,
 Virginia)

Ocean View School District, Huntington Beach, California

Donald Devor, Principal, Haven View School
 Dr. Robert Lindstrom, Assistant Superintendent (Now
 Assistant Superintendent, Cupertino, California,
 Unified School District)
 Monte McMurray, Assistant Superintendent

Olathe, Kansas, Unified School District

Jack Larson, Assistant Superintendent

Paradise Valley School District, Phoenix, Arizona

H. Ray Shipley, Superintendent

Pleasanton, California, Joint School District

Dr. William Schreck, Assistant Superintendent

Project PSI, Derby, Kansas

Donald Crowell, Principal, El Paso Elementary School

St. Louis, Missouri, Public Schools, Beaumont-Sumner District

Mrs. Joan M. Bryant, Principal, Gundlach Elementary
 School
 Dr. Benjamin M. Price, District Superintendent

San Diego, California, Caity Schools

Edward Fletcher, Director, Research and Development
 Dr. William H. Stegeman, Deputy Superintendent

San Juan Unified School District, Carmichael, California

Dr. Leslie M. Chase, Assistant Superintendent
 Mrs. Vivian Geddes, Curriculum Specialist
 Gene Starns, Principal, Sierra Oaks Elementary School
 George L. White, Principal, Bella Vista High School

School City of Gary, Indiana

Nicholas McDonald, Director, Instruction, and District
 Administrator for Middle Schools

Seattle, Washington Public Schools

Robert Bell, Principal, Chief Sealth High School
 Herbert E. Boies, Principal, Viewlands Elementary School

Dr. Forbes Bottomly, Superintendent (Now Executive Director
Metropolitan Boston Educational Planning Project,
Newton, Massachusetts)

William D. Hall, Principal, West Seattle High School

Dr. Charles R. Hough, Director, District Relations

William Maynard, Principal, Cleveland High School

Norm Pickard, Area Administrator, South Region

Peter Schneller, Principal, Ballard High School

James Shelton, Principal, Maple Leaf Elementary School

Dr. Richard Taylor, Principal, Rainier High School

Richard J. West, Area Administrator, Region Two

Shoreline Public Schools, Seattle, Washington

Lynn T. Waller, Principal, Shorecrest High School

Spokane, Washington, Public Schools

Dr. Harry Finnegan, Coordinator, Program Development

Tulsa, Oklahoma, Public Schools

Dr. Gordon Cawelti, Superintendent (Now Executive
Secretary, Association for Supervision and
Curriculum Development, Washington, D.C.)

Dr. Bruce Howell, Superintendent

Scott Richardson, Director, Secondary Curriculum

Unified School District 457, Garden City, Kansas

Dr. Horace Good, Superintendent

Dr. Jerry O. Schreiner, Director of Instruction (Now
Executive Secretary, United School Administrators
of Kansas, Topeka)

University of Utah, Department of Educational Administration,

Dr. Lloyd E. McCleary, Professor

Ventura, California, Unified School District

Dr. Patrick Rooney, Superintendent

Washington, D.C., Public Schools

Elmer Mitchell, Principal (now retired)

Mrs. Greta D. Murchison, Principal (Now Executive
Assistant, East Orange, New Jersey, Public Schools)

Weber County School District, Ogden, Utah

V. E. Griffin, Assistant Principal, Roy Junior High School
 Dr. Spencer Wyatt, Director, Weber Community Educational Service Center

West Valley School District, Yakima, Washington

William Heath, Principal, West Valley High School

Widefield School District, Security, Colorado

W. L. Stenson, Assistant Superintendent

Williamsville, New York, Central Schools

Robert Schaefer, Principal, Heim Middle School

CFK Ltd. Foundation

Charles F. Kettering II, The Late Chairman, CFK Ltd. Board of Directors

Dr. B. Frank Brown, Member, CFK Ltd. Board of Directors
 (Director, I/D/E/A Information and Services Division, Melbourne, Florida)

Senator George L. Brown, Member, CFK Ltd. Board of Directors
 (Executive Director, Metro Denver Urban Coalition and Member, Colorado State Senate)

Jean S. Kettering, Chairwoman, CFK Ltd. Board of Directors

Leo C. McKenna, Secretary-Treasurer, CFK Ltd. Board of Directors (Vice President, Dominick & Dominick, Inc., New York, New York)

Dr. Edward Brainard, President, CFK Ltd.
 Cecelia J. Logan, Executive Assistant, CFK Ltd.

Additional CFK Ltd. Associates

Lawrence J. Aggerbeck, President, L. J. Aggerbeck and Associates, Palatine, Illinois

Dr. William E. Engbretson, President, Governors State University, Park Forest South, Illinois

Dr. Robert S. Fox, Director, ERIC Clearing House, Boulder, Colorado and Professor (on leave), University of Michigan

Dr. William Georgiades, Professor, School of Education, University of Southern California, Los Angeles

Dr. Clifford G. Houston, Boulder, Colorado

Eugene R. Howard, Superintendent, Urbana, Illinois, School District

Joseph J. Nold, Executive Director, Colorado Outward Bound
School, Denver, Colorado
Dr. James L. Olivero, Executive Director, Nueva Day School
and Learning Center, Hillsborough, California
Grover E. Petersen, Counselor, Jefferson Senior High School,
Bloomington, Minnesota, Public Schools
Dr. Thomas A. Shaheen, San Francisco, California
Dr. Dudley Solomon, Executive Director, Children's Asthma
Research Institute and Hospital, Denver, Colorado
George R. Walters, DeKalb, Illinois, Community Unit School
District